

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800 Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400 www.cmap.illinois.gov

# **Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, October 20, 2010

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

DuPage County Conference Room

Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Willis Tower, Chicago, Illinois

#### **Members Present:**

Mark Avery (chair), Ed Paesel (co-chair), Judy Beck, Robert Cole, Roger Dahlstrom, Kristi De-Laurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Nicole Nutter (for Heather Tabbert), Curt Paddock, Dennis Sandquist, Heather Smith, Bob Sullivan (for Karie Friling), Nancy Williamson

#### **Members Absent:**

Jerry Conrad, David Galowich, Jim LaBelle, Robert Palmer, Nathaniel Werner, Norm West

### **Staff Present:**

Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), Hala Ahmed, Lindsay Banks, Patricia Berry, Lee Deuben, Matthew Maloney, Pete Saunders

### **Others Present:**

Jennifer Hale (UIC, IDOT), Robert Munson (CMAP Citizen Advisory Committee), Ryan Richter (Metra), Jason Saavedra (UIC)

#### 1.0 Call to Order

Chairman Mark Avery called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

## 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Lee Deuben gave a brief announcement about the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant that CMAP will be receiving from HUD. The details of CMAP's technical assistance program that will be funded by the grant are to be determined in the near future, but it is known that there will be a competitive process for applying for assistance, although the time frame for the application process is still being figured out.

### 3.0 Approval of Meeting Notes

A motion to approve the minutes of August 18, 2010, was made by Curt Paddock, and seconded by Dennis Sandquist. All in favor, the motion carried.

#### 4.0 Legislative Update

Chair Mark Avery commented that there was no legislative news, but also noted that a veto session convenes for six days in November.

**5.0 2011 CMAP/RTA Joint Community Planning Program** – Hala Ahmed, CMAP Hala Ahmed briefly informed the committee of CMAP's coordination of its Unified Work Program (UWP)-funded grant program with the RTA's Community Planning program. While CMAP's grant program and the RTA's program will remain separate and distinct, they will share application materials and solicit projects during the same time frame. This is intended to reduce the burden on applicants, as they will only need to submit one application for both programs, rather than separate applications.

The RTA's program focuses on Transportation Oriented Development (TOD) projects and local transit improvements; CMAP's program will be somewhat broader, focusing on the intersection between land use and transportation in general.

Once applications are received, CMAP and the RTA will jointly review applications, and will determine which funding source is more appropriate for each project. Each agency will then work with applicants to fully scope projects and will follow its designated approval process. In CMAP's case, this will involve discussing a proposed program of projects with the working committees during summer 2011, and ultimately receiving formal approval from the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

In response, Judy Beck encouraged CMAP and the RTA to focus on parking and stormwater issues.

**6.0 Implementation of** *GO TO 2040:* **Technical Assistance** – Pete Saunders, CMAP Mark Avery introduced Pete Saunders, who proceeded to present his study of regional technical assistance programs around the country (as detailed in the memo "Implementation of GO TO 2040: Technical Assistance (memo)," posted under the October 20 meeting materials, or by direct link <a href="here">here</a>), specifically focusing on programs that provide technical assistance to local communities as a means of regional plan implementation.

While there were a few examples of very robust "Level 1" programs, 10 out of the 21 MPOs studied have more modest programs (identified as "Level 5," in which he MPO acts as a gatherer or facilitator of information specifically about its region, and disseminates the information to municipalities).

Nancy Williamson asked how these programs are funded, and Pete answered that they are typically part of the general budget, but may also include grant funding.

Roger Dahlstrom commented that the Atlanta Regional Commission's program seems very well funded, and he suggested that it would be worthwhile to do additional research on specifics of funding of these programs. Pete responded that ARC seemed to allocate a (relatively small amount) \$1 million.

Rob Cole asked whether projects had evaluated the degree of success, including indicators, noting that CMAP has

- Developed a plan
- And now is beginning to implement the plan
- And so the next step would seem to be this evaluation of success.
  - o "We learn more from failures than successes"
  - o Need a set of metrics, drawn from the recommendations in the GO TO 2040 plan
  - The Village of Oak Park often tries to compare itself to other comparable municipalities
- Pete answered that many initiatives have follow-up.

Judy Beck commented that the committee needed more information, because a number of questions remain, including whether these studied programs focus on growth areas.

Niki Nutter commented that many of these technical assistance initiatives are long-term, so the outcome can be difficult to gauge.

Roger Dahlstrom commented that by his reading the "concept of broad applicability" was not adequately addressed in the memo. In other words, CMAP should be asking the questions

- who will benefit most?
- Where would (e.g. model ordinances) have the greatest benefit?
- Replicability (i.e. most effective demonstration projects)?

Pete responded that many of the studied MPOs have extensive selection criteria.

Judy Beck commented that it is important to understand what motivations were behind planning, providing the examples of the effect of the 1996 Summer Olympics on Atlanta's transit system, or areas with severe pollution.

Curt Paddock stated that he wasn't clear what input was wanted by CMAP. Mark Avery responded that he saw this discussion as an introduction to the topic.

Ed Paesel noted that NIPC had looked at MPOs in a similar way just before CMAP was formed, and a representative from ARC had come to speak about their programs. He suggested that it might be helpful for the committee to have a discussion with a representative from one or two of the technical assistance models most attractive to CMAP and the committee.

Bob Sullivan commented that typically technical assistance are things like corridor studies, etc., which is good but there is not enough follow-through. He would prefer to strategic capital improvements rather than "amorphous" corridor studies. He also wondered about the idea of using universities to play a role in these technical assistance programs and initiatives. He suggested that economically challenged areas would benefit more from assistance that helps them establish a "gateway" that might help spur future development.

Lisa DiChiera asked where would CMAP be in comparison to these other MPOs studies – i.e. what level of technical assistance. Pete answered mostly Level 2 or 3 (as well as some Level 1).

Kristi DeLaurentiis asked whether technical assistance initiatives studied had defined priorities (for example T.O.D.), or was there additional public engagement after the plan to determine priorities for implementation? Pete answered that there were examples of this, including a priority/focus on T.O.D. in San Francisco.

Nancy Williamson suggested that priorities should probably be linked to available funding and grants, and perhaps private consultants—specifically developers with solid on-the-ground experience—could be recruited for technical assistance programs, in which they would charge a highly-reduced fee.

• Kristi DeLaurentiis added that perhaps CMAP could develop a list of consultants similar to the RTA's list of approved consultants (for its Community Planning and Subregional Planning programs).

Judy Beck observed that there is a need to be able to visualize good planning vs. bad planning for the general public.

Kristi DeLaurentiis noted that communities without "shovel ready" projects are at a significant disadvantage, and the key is to get to a place where a community is ready for development.

Roger Dahlstrom observed that out of date comprehensive plans have heavily influenced the patterns of development.

Curt Paddock shared that in Will County, their top three top areas of focus are:

- Planning related to a 3rd airport in region, including a multijuridictional plan for surrounding municipalities
- Comprehensive overhaul of Will County's zoning ordinance
- Intermodal transportation plan

Rob Cole stated that helping with outdated zoning ordinances should be a top priority for CMAP's technical assistance program. Dennis Sandquist added that zoning ordinance assistance can significantly help with implementation problems, but noted that if CMAP develops model ordinances, it should talk to those who have developed them for use on the ground.

Stephen Ostrander asked whether counties and municipalities felt like they were sufficiently informed about grant opportunities, etc. Most answered that they were satisfied with their level of knowledge (some subscribe to services – e.g. Grants USA).

### 7.0 Next Meeting:

January 19, 2011 (tentative)

# 8.0 Other Business

None

# 9.0 Public Comment

None

# 10.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55am

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Ostrander

Staff Liaison to the Land Use Committee